

6/26/2004

To: Kamyar
From: Alex Hildebrand
cc: Mike Wade for distribution
John Herrick

The purpose of this e-mail is to discuss concerns with the proposed “Scenario Evaluation Tools” and their use in developing the water supply needed per each of three scenarios. A reader will probably assume incorrectly that the three scenarios bracket the magnitude of the probably water supply needed to meet all of the state’s needs in 2030. However, the proposed scenarios and method of evaluation would fall far short of doing this.

The urban evaluation proposes to develop a per person annual need for urban water as the population grows. The per person need then varies among scenarios with different assumptions of housing density, etc. It is not clear whether the statewide water need for each scenario will also be adjusted for water which is delivered for urban use but not consumed, and which therefore is or can be recovered for reuse. This should be done.

In the case of the Ag water evaluation there is no effort to evaluate the water that will be needed per person per year to produce an adequate supply of food and other Ag products. The U.C. Riverside report, which is being added to the appendix, indicates that it will continue to require about 0.75 acre feet per year of water consumed to provide food for each person. The Water Plan in one sentence acknowledges that it takes far more water per person to produce food than to meet that person’s urban needs. Yet instead of evaluating that need the evaluation of Ag water use in these scenarios proposes to bury any attention to that fact by extensive speculation about future crop mixes, and assuming that the crop mix will be adjusted to reduce consumptive use of water instead of to provide adequate food that meets public preferences, and assuming that as urban sprawl takes farm land, farmers will not move to other land if they have the water, etc. It

is not clear whether it is also assumed that the production of food will just be reduced by providing insufficient Ag water and that this is an acceptable plan even though it violates the legal requirements to be met by the plan.

It is not good enough to bury near the back of Volume 4 an acknowledgment that various legal requirements for the Water Plan will not be met in this issue. It should be acknowledged in connection with these scenario evaluations that the proposed scenarios and their evaluation do not comply with Water Code Section 100004.6a, or Section 411. The chart in Volume 4 of current non-compliance and possible future compliance with the law, should not refer to the AIC report as if it partially complied with Section 411, and should not refer to that report without also referring to the U.C. Riverside Report. DWR should be embarrassed to say that they can't guess that 40% more people will need 40% more food until CDFA says so. They should also realize that when Section 10004.6 refers to enough water to meet all the state's needs that includes the need for food as well as for housing.